DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 176 587 FL 010 821

AUTHOR Benseler, David P.; Schulz, Renate A.
TITLE Intensive Foreign Language Courses. Language in Education: Theory and Practice, No. 18.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, Arlington, Va.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Sep 79
NOTE 60p.
AVAILABLE FROM Center for Applied Linguistics, 1611, N. Kent Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209 ($4.95)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Course Content; *Course Evaluation; *Course Organization; Credit Courses; *Evaluation Methods; *Intensive Language Courses; *Language Instruction; Language Programs; Personnel Selection; Scheduling; Screening Tests; *Second Language Learning; Student Recruitment
IDENTIFIERS Information Analysis Products

ABSTRACT

Intensive foreign language courses are discussed in terms of historical background, categorization of types, definition of components of intensive instruction as practiced at present in academic settings, and advantages and special problems of intensive instruction. Practical considerations for the implementation of intensive options cover the following areas: (1) publicizing and recruiting for intensive courses, (2) screening and selection of students, (3) scheduling, (4) staffing and coordination of instruction, (5) granting of academic credit, and (6) testing and evaluation. Approximately half of this document is devoted to a bibliography. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED176587

LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION: THEORY AND PRACTICE

18

Intensive Foreign Language Courses

David P. Benseler
Renate A. Schulz

FL 010821

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Center for Applied Linguistics

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Published by
Center for Applied Linguistics

Prepared by
ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics

Language in Education: Theory and Practice
Series ISBN: 87281-092-5

ISBN: 87281-104-2

September 1979
Copyright © 1979
By the Center for Applied Linguistics
1611 North Kent Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Printed in the U.S.A.

LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION: THEORY AND PRACTICE

ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) is a nationwide network of information centers, each responsible for a given educational level or field of study. ERIC is supported by the National Institute of Education of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The basic objective of ERIC is to make current developments in educational research, instruction, and personnel preparation more readily accessible to educators and members of related professions.

ERIC/CLL. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics (ERIC/CLL), one of the specialized clearinghouses in the ERIC system, is operated by the Center for Applied Linguistics. ERIC/CLL is specifically responsible for the collection and dissemination of information in the general area of research and application in languages, linguistics, and language teaching and learning.

LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION: THEORY AND PRACTICE. In addition to processing information, ERIC/CLL is also involved in information synthesis and analysis. The Clearinghouse commissions recognized authorities in languages and linguistics to write analyses of the current issues in their areas of specialty. The resultant documents, intended for use by educators and researchers, are published under the title Language in Education: Theory and Practice.* The series includes practical guides for classroom teachers, extensive state-of-the-art papers, and selected bibliographies.

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either ACTFL or NIE. This publication is not printed at the expense of the Federal Government.

This publication may be purchased directly from the Center for Applied Linguistics. It also will be announced in the ERIC monthly abstract journal Resources in Education (RIE) and will be available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Computer Microfilm International Corp., P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210. See RIE for ordering information and ED number.

For further information on the ERIC system, ERIC/CLL, and Center/Clearinghouse publications, write to ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, VA 22209.

From 1974 through 1977, all Clearinghouse publications appeared as the CAL-ERIC/CLL Series on Languages and Linguistics. Although more papers are being added to the original series, the majority of the ERIC/CLL information analysis products will be included in the Language in Education series.

Contrary to the now common belief among foreign language educators, intensive foreign language courses are neither new nor necessarily innovative approaches to teaching languages. While some seemingly innovative applications of this instructional strategy have been developed in recent years, intensive study was already being talked and written about in 1919 (Hills).

During the forties, foreign language teachers attending professional meetings heard intensive courses touted as a revolution in foreign language teaching, as a means of convincing the American populace that foreign language study was beneficial to students and society alike, and as a way of drawing hoards of students to our classrooms. The professional journals of the mid- to late forties and early fifties abound with essays on the concept, and current journals indeed seldom appear without announcements, advertisements, descriptions, and/or reports on intensive courses covering nearly all the languages taught in this country. In fact, our review of publications pertinent to the topic yielded over three hundred citations (see Select Bibliography below).

The present report seeks to: (1) provide a brief historical background of the concept of intensive foreign language instruction; (2) list types of courses that have been developed using an intensive concept; (3) define the components of intensive instruction as practiced at present in academic settings; (4) discuss advantages and special problems of intensive instruction; (5) offer some

practical guidelines to departments considering implementing intensive instructional options; (6) point to some areas in need of study and development; and (7) provide a bibliography of important publications on this topic.

Historical Background

While already a concept in the early years of this century, intensive foreign language courses and programs trace their serious origins back to World War II. In those days the term "intensive" was used to designate language courses taught under the auspices of the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP), also called the Foreign Area and Language Studies Program. These programs not only formulated the principles of audiolingualism that were to become the dominant method of foreign language instruction during the 1960s and 1970s, but they also developed the basic tenets of intensive instruction, most of which are still accepted today.

The ASTP model provided for: (1) a large number of instructional contact hours within a relatively short period of time; (2) a limited number of students per class/section; (3) a combination of presentation of language structure and conversational practice; (4) an emphasis on drill and on the formation of linguistic habits; (5) an introduction to principles of phonemic analysis and transcription; (6) a course of instruction and drill by native informants; and (7) a command of the colloquial spoken form of the language(s) studied (Springer 1944: 226-27).

The following is an excerpt from an ASTP course description from 1944:

> Methodology. Any methodology which will achieve the objective outlined is acceptable. Provision is made in the curriculum for seventeen contact hours of language study. These can be effectively used in accordance with the following plan: (a) One-hour demonstrations, five days a week, by the senior instructor of the course on the structure . . . of the language; (b) Two-hour drill sessions, six days a week, in the

> presence of a drillmaster who is a colloquial speaker of the language, preferably native born. Work in drill sessions is under supervision of the senior instructor who sees that it is keyed to demonstrations on structure . . . . The supervised drill sessions should give the trainees protracted practice in the form of conversations which exemplify principles brought out in the immediately preceding demonstration on structure. They should further provide review drill on the material previously covered. It is of crucial importance that the number of trainees in the supervised drill sessions be kept small . . . . In general an instructional team will consist of: (a) One senior instructor for each assignment of eighty men; (b) Four drill-masters for each eighty men. Under this arrangement the time of the senior instructor would be absorbed in offering the five demonstrations a week on structure, and in supervising the drill-masters. Each drill-master would handle two two-hour sections of ten men each per day. The drill-masters need not be trained teachers; their chief function is to speak their own language . . . . Care must be exercised to prevent the drill-masters from misinterpreting their function and assuming the role of teaching the structure of the language . . . . As far as practicable, men studying the same language should be housed and messed together and otherwise encouraged to practice the language they are studying (Springer 1944: 225-26).

What the description just cited really means is a nine-month course (36 weeks) at 17-18 contact hours per week for an instructional total of 612 hours--contrasted with anywhere from 180-300 hours in a normal four-semester/six-quarter sequence.[1]

Since the concept was successful in a military setting, educators soon began to consider utilizing it in civilian learning situations. A 1946 issue of the German Quarterly describes intensive courses and programs located in 16 American institutions of higher education.[2]

The transition from a military to a civilian setting did not take place without serious differences of professional opinion, however. Urging caution for a profession running pell-mell to ride the "bandwagon," Morgan (1943) concluded, "Extravagant claims for the 'intensive' language course should be discounted. No new principle of language learning is involved, and the results attained will be found on close scrutiny to maintain a constant ratio to the amount of time spent on teaching and learning."

Reacting to Morgan in a later issue of the same journal, Fuerst (1944) attempted to define the concept in terms of oral objectives, while implicitly disagreeing with his colleague:

> The name 'intensive course' is well given: to talk a foreign language requires more intensive study than either reading, comprehending, or writing . . . . Yet the intensive course deserves to have an intensive method. If it is to rival the other methods, so perfectly developed, so practically pursuing their limited objectives, then it has to become a method by which speaking comes, not only first, but easiest: earlier and easier than reading. If we develop such a course--and it is being developed--then we shall have a right to call it Intensive Method. Then the 'intensity' will no longer 'apply only to an effort, which in this case is an effort on the student's part,' nor will it consist merely in a 'more concentrated use of the student's time.' Then 'intensity' will mean a determination, on the part of teacher and student, and a dedication of the material toward speaking fluency. Even if the dosage of a course so oriented would have to come close to a 'dribble method' again, it would still be the Intensive Method: the method for the exclusively speaking objective (p. 101).

The debate, not only between Morgan and Fuerst, continued for several years. Finally, Morgan (1950) gave what were to be his final printed words of consequence on the subject. He names those factors operative in the success of

the ASTP and points to the limitations of the "intensive oral method" in a traditional academic setting:

> (1) The cost of the language program--exorbitant by peace-time standards--was of no moment, since the Army (i.e., the taxpayer) was footing the bill. (2) The motivation of the language learner--directly related to war aims on the one hand, to personal ambition on the other--was exceptional, if not unique. (3) The student participants were screened in advance; they were on the whole of superior mentality, segregated by sexes, and organized in classes of uncommonly small size. (4) Army discipline applied not only to classroom attendance, but also to homework and to home living. Distractions were at a minimum. (5) The unprecedented allotment of weekly hours to foreign language study, a daring innovation in itself, could be and was justified only by the emergency character of the national situation. (6) Flunking, always a serious problem in school administration, was taken care of by the simple device of 'separating' the failing students from the language class.

While intensive foreign language instruction--contrary to Morgan's opinion--can be (and has been) successfully implemented in a peace-time academic setting, the factors mentioned above do remain problematic.

Efforts to adapt the ASTP intensive approach to traditional academic programs continued in the fifties. Menut (1953) states that

> the term intensive as a designation applied to foreign language courses has already become a highly elastic, equivocal expression. It is being used indiscriminately to denote such widely different courses as those so called in academic programs, where 250 hours of class attendance is the yearly norm; while at the same time it is applied also to the Army Language School program amounting to 1,350 hours of class work (p. 189).

Menut further notes that a "slow but sure" extensive method of foreign language instruction practiced in the

traditional academic setting never stood in great favor in the United States. "It runs counter to the national psychology of impatience with piecemeal processes. The approved American way is to settle down and compress ten years of distributed effort into one year of total concentration" (p. 189).

Despite his sarcasm, Menut's statement on the American way seems to be the basic rationale for what was to become the "intensive course" of the sixties and seventies in this country. The major attraction of such courses appears to be indeed the promise of a quick way to gain sufficient fluency to use the language in travel, study, or work abroad, or to fulfill an academic requirement in a minimum amount of time. The labels applied to intensive courses and programs, drawn from journals and from college and university catalogues, attest to the importance of speed: (1) accelerated; (2) concentrated; (3) condensed; (4) immersion; (5) intensive; and (6) hurry-up.

Types of Intensive Courses

The major goal of intensive instruction as practiced in the Defense Language Institute (or Army Language School, as it has been known for years) was, of course, near-native oral command of a language by adult learners. Since then, however, intensive courses have been developed for a variety of purposes and audiences:

(1) Intensive courses that stress specific isolated skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing) or that address a particular level (elementary, intermediate, advanced).

(2) Intensive courses for language teachers who utilize them as a means of review and/or for purposes of continuing education. While such courses normally mix regularly enrolled students and the teacher-turned-student, those intended especially for teachers often combine classroom experiences with living conditions and informal entertainment--all in the target language. This type of course can be found at Eastern Washington State College, Illinois State University, Middlebury, and at various summer schools within the United States.

(3) Language weekends, retreats, and/or camps providing a short-term immersion experience for high school and college students as well as for teachers (e.g., Ervin 1976).

(4) Intensive courses for specific groups other than foreign language teachers: (a) for the blind (MacDonald 1966); (b) for engineers (Mitchell 1944); (c) for architects (Ferrari 1973); (d) for [non-specific] business and industry ("International Business . . . " 1973, Jordan 1977, McBride 1973); (e) for medical personnel (Tabery 1973); (f) for graduate students from disciplines other than language study (Benseler and Mazur 1973).

(5) Intensive courses for such service-oriented volunteer groups as the Peace Corps, VISTA, and Teacher Corps (Ferrigno 1963, Fiks 1968, Iversen 1963, Kulakow 1968).

(6) Intensive courses in preparation for specific study tours (Lamson 1974).

(7) Intensive study of language, literature, culture, and civilization during a regular semester (Hirschmann 1973).

(8) Intensive study on the high school level (Wattenmaker 1979).

(9) Intensive courses (on college campuses) designed to provide high school seniors with a "head start," as it were, on a college education (Benseler 1978).

(10) Immersion courses in the U.S. and in target language countries. While immersion and intensive experiences often go hand in hand--as is the case with many study programs abroad and with some special summer programs in the U.S.--the two concepts are not necessarily synonymous. The distinguishing factor of an immersion course is that the foreign language is the medium of instruction and personal interaction in and out of the classroom, but learning other than language learning per se can be the objective. Intensive instruction, on the other hand, presupposes neither exclusive use of the target language in the classroom nor around-the-clock contact with the language. Rather, the distinguishing

factor of intensive instruction is the compression of foreign language content into a short time period (not necessarily a characteristic of an immersion course).

(11) Immersion experiences provided by residential facilities. While some institutions provide no regular intensive options per se, a form of intensive exposure is available through special language houses or dormitories, which offer systematic opportunities--for credit or non-credit--to engage in formal or informal conversation with fluent speakers of the target language. They also make available tutors, lectures, films, radio programs, and other programs dealing with the target language or culture (Baumann 1976).

The following pages of this report will focus on those intensive courses and programs aimed at developing general language proficiency of students in traditional academic settings. We will not attempt a systematic review of special purpose courses aimed only at the development of particular language skills. We will not include courses for special audiences, immersion courses, programs conducted in a target language country, short-term intensive exposures to a language in such extracurricular settings as language camps, weekends, retreats, etc., or courses offered by commercial (non-academic) language schools.

Intensive courses have become a popular addition to the college foreign language curriculum. Evidence of their success and growing popularity is supported by several recent publications describing successful and/or innovative programs that have attracted considerable student interest during an otherwise bleak period of decline in foreign language enrollments.

In Options for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Literatures and Cultures, for instance, Born and Buck (1978) list 58 intensive or immersion courses in various languages. Four out of ten successful programs described in a recent Change Magazine special issue offer intensive foreign language instruction ("Report on Teaching . . . " 1978). A national survey conducted during 1977 revealed that approximately 50 percent of responding four-year institutions and 13 percent of responding two-year colleges make available some form of intensive instruction

(Schulz 1978). In many instances, the programs described have simply compressed instructional time of two or more academic terms into one, so as to offer a more concentrated exposure to a particular language than is possible in the traditional semester. Otherwise, staffing, course objectives, teaching materials, and teaching strategies remain the same. The same survey revealed that intensive courses in a regular academic setting have a history of mixed success. While some departments have built them into successful program options in terms of student achievement and enrollments, others have experienced failure and have found that the problems inherent in intensive instruction could not be overcome in their particular setting.

Components of Intensive Instruction

Intensive instruction, as practiced at present, has no clear definition. The term can refer to any course that involves students in a structured learning situation for more than the otherwise normal one classroom period per day. Courses range from summer total immersion programs (Schneider 1977) to intensive semester or academic year courses with up to 40 hours of classroom instruction per week (Benseler 1978, Schulz 1978:71-83) to intensive January interim courses (Du Verlie 1973, Tyler 1970, Wallace 1972) to intensive Saturday courses meeting for six hours of instruction once a week during the semester (e.g., the Department of French at the University of Maryland has experimented with such a course). The concept presupposes no particular methodology, linguistic theory, special materials, or facilities. However, some factors appear to be common to a number of successful programs described in the professional literature. In essence these characteristics are still those identified and utilized in the ASTP intensive model:

(1) They provide extended daily exposure to the language, ranging from two to eight hours per day, within a relatively short span of time.

(2) Generally, they require a larger number of classroom contact hours per academic credit earned than do traditional courses. Increases of up to 75 percent in instruc-

tional time are common in regular academic programs. Reschke (1977) describes a "semi-intensive" program that requires a total of 196 contact hours over two semesters rather than the 112 hours necessary for the same number of credits in the traditional two-semester sequence.

(3) Intensive instruction is usually conducted in small classes. Even if total enrollment exceeds 30 students, oral drill and conversational practice are carried on in small groups of from four to ten participants.

(4) Most successful intensive courses are team-taught and staffed by more than one instructor. Obviously, few individuals would have the stamina to direct learning activities in an intensive language classroom for several hours in a row. In addition, contact with different persons helps keep up interest and motivation, and, of course, exposes students to a range of speakers. The teaching team often consists of one or two professional teachers assisted by paraprofessionals who receive on-the-job training and work under the direction of the trained teacher(s).

(5) The focus of instruction is primarily oral/aural, emphasizes colloquial everyday language use, and covers all major aspects of grammar necessary for clear communication in the target language.

(6) Little or no use is made of English; the target language is the medium of instruction insofar as possible.

(7) Regular practice in the language laboratory is required for supplementary drill and reinforcement.

(8) Students are constantly provided with feedback and are frequently evaluated.

(9) Extra-curricular activities are offered that give students the opportunity to come in contact with the target language in real-life contexts and to use the language as a means of communication in a non-classroom setting.

(10) The staff is willing to devote (and, often to donate) considerably more time and energy to planning and instruction than are necessary in traditional courses.

Schneider (1977) summarizes the basic features of the seven-week intensive German summer program at Middlebury College as follows:

> (1) Drill sections were small; (2) the composition of the groups was changed often in order [to] avoid the formation of sub-groups and to encourage a more lively exchange of ideas between students; (3) instructors were changed every hour in order to expose the students to as many idiolects as possible; (4) classrooms were changed every hour in order to avoid monotony; and (5) quizzes, written every other day, were corrected and returned at the end of the same period in which they were written.

He further emphasizes two aspects that he believes are of special importance to the success of the course. One is the use of audiovisual materials, not only to introduce new vocabulary and aspects of the target language culture, but also to counteract fatigue. The second is the provision of such social events as dances, picnics, weekend excursions, choir practices, and soccer games--all of which reinforce aspects of language learned in the classroom.

Advantages and Problems of Intensive Instruction

Frank (1972a) believes that intensive instruction is "not only the most effective but also the most attractive method" of foreign language study in the American classroom, and Paquette (1973) proposes that "beginning and intermediate foreign language instruction be offered exclusively in 'total immersion programs.'" However, intensive foreign language instruction poses special constraints that warrant careful consideration and planning before any department commits itself to offering an intensive option. Schulz (1978) has summarized some of the advantages of intensive courses as follows:

> (1) They expose students to a concentrated body of language and facilitate more intensive and extensive skill practice, therefore resembling, more than their traditional one-hour-per-day counterparts, a

> natural language learning situation; (2) they enable students to gain extensive knowledge of and proficiency in the language without the usual lengthy time commitments; (3) they permit 'late bloomers,' procrastinating seniors, and petrified Ph.D. candidates to fulfill a language requirement or a long-standing interest or ambition, again in a relatively short amount of time and without penalty in terms of postponed graduation; (4) they permit students majoring in various disciplines to pick up a supportive concentration in a foreign language; (5) they permit high school seniors, 'professional tourists,' and businessmen a quick, concentrated introduction or refresher course in a language; and (6) . . . they can cause an easy camaraderie among students and faculty . . . and . . . often motivate further language study (pp. 145-46).

Deveny and Bookout (1976) list as additional benefits of intensive instruction its ability to give good publicity and visibility to a department; to provide low cost per credit hour instruction [though the authors apparently do not include the increased commitment in instructional time and energy in their cost assessment]; to give summer employment to teachers (a somewhat self-serving, but nevertheless important consideration . . .); and, because of the rapid progress, to provide much personal satisfaction to instructors and students alike. If the intensive course is offered in an immersion setting, a major additional benefit is, as Schneider stresses, that students "learn the language in a meaningful situation rather than in a social vacuum" (1977:27). But the most important advantage of intensive instruction lies in the evidence that such courses can develop superior language proficiency and help attract students to advanced study. Deveny and Bookout maintain that students are "better prepared than their counterparts who go through the normal two-semester elementary language sequence or who come into intermediate courses directly from high school" (1976:63); and Benseler (1978) and Schulz (1978) document the beneficial effect intensive options can have on enrollments.

Unfortunately, the problems and constraints of intensive instruction are almost as numerous as the advantages. It

is a foregone conclusion that intensive instruction is not, and never will be, the panacea of foreign language instruction in this country. Intensive foreign language study requires high motivation, which is not always present in students fulfilling requirements in lower division service courses. For optimum results, intensive instruction should be limited to that relatively small number of students who are willing, able, and sufficiently self-disciplined to commit the necessary time and energy.

Motivation, while perhaps the most important prerequisite for intensive study, is not the sole factor that guarantees success. The accelerated pace of an intensive course and the usual emphasis on development of oral skills require special aptitudes and learning skills that are not equally possessed by all learners. Carroll (1974) has stressed the speed of acquisition as the most crucial variable in successful language learning. Indeed, Lamson (1974) has identified the largest single problem in intensive instruction as accommodating those students who learn a language slowly. Since intensive courses usually permit little opportunity for self-pacing, and instruction and study time are more strictly defined and limited than in conventional or individualized instruction, the number of students who will be successful in gaining the desired objectives of an intensive course will also be limited.

Scheduling can be another constraint in intensive instruction. Ideally, students should be able to devote the term(s) during which they enroll in intensive foreign language study exclusively to that pursuit. Unless such a course is offered during an interim or summer session, however, few students feel that they can devote a full academic term to language study; yet the distraction and demands of other courses prevent maximum benefits of the intensive exposure. As already mentioned, intensive instruction often requires more contact hours per credit earned than does its conventional counterpart; students and teachers alike might be reluctant to commit such extra time.

The problems of academic credit and transfer must be dealt with also. Intensive courses offer up to two academic years of language study in one semester (Frank 1973). Enrollment in an intensive course thus commits a

substantial block of course credit. By the time students find out whether their aptitude, energy, learning style, and self-discipline are suitable for an intensive language-learning experience, it is usually too late for them to transfer to other courses. The unsuccessful student might thus lose as much as an entire semester or up to 16 hours worth of course credit.

Benseler and Mazur (1973) point out that intensive summer courses can be self-supporting, and Deveny and Bookout (1976) describe a course that is relatively low in cost per credit hour. However, intensive instruction--if it aims at offering an optimum learning situation with a team of instructors, small group instruction, a variety of supportive instructional hardware and software, flexible room facilities, and opportunities to engage in language-related activities in and outside the classroom --is usually more expensive than instruction in traditional courses. Although a class might indeed generate a large number of "Full-Time Equivalents," it also requires a larger commitment of instructor time and resources than does traditional instruction. Because most successful intensive programs involve a team-teaching approach, the planning and coordination of daily instruction can put special demands on the staff. If paraprofessional personnel are utilized in instruction, careful daily planning, training, and supervision are mandatory.

The consensus of educators who have implemented successful intensive options is that such courses accelerate language learning; however, some teachers feel that the short-term concentration of content might work counter to expectations for adult learners of a second language because it does not permit sufficient absorption or "digestion" time. These same individuals express the fear that the linguistic retention of students who have learned a foreign language in an intensive setting is not as good as that of students coming from traditional courses. While no reliable empirical data are available that compare retention after traditional as opposed to intensive instruction, comparison of achievement scores overwhelmingly favors students from intensive instructional options. Williamson (1968b), for instance, compared the performance of 19 students in an intensive eight-week summer program with that of 196 students who

had had four semesters of Spanish with conventional instruction and found that the intensive group compared favorably to the conventional group after one year of study; 12 of the 19 students from the intensive group achieved scores comparable to those of the conventional group after two years of study. After a seven-week immersion program, Schneider (1977) reports average scores above the 90th percentile rank on all skills tests of the MLA Cooperative German test normed on students who have completed two semesters of conventional German instruction. On the form of the test that is normed on a college population with four semesters of conventional language study, Schneider's subjects' average reading score at the 83rd percentile rank is the only skill average below the 90th percentile. Similarly positive results, especially as far as the speaking skill is concerned, are reported by Wallace (1972). Although none of the reported studies dealt with large numbers or attempted to control sampling procedures or instructional variables apart from the time factor, we feel it safe to share Kalivoda's (1975) conclusion that at least some students can benefit greatly from intensive instruction under some conditions. The problem is, of course, to identify those students and those conditions.

Many intensive courses either prepare students for an imminent stay abroad (Lamson 1974, Rassias 1970) or attract a large number of students who want to learn the language for eventual travel, study, or work in a target language country. Wallace (1972) maintains that such practical extrinsic motivation is not prerequisite to success in intensive study, and Benseler's Washington State University experience supports that view. The student who has enrolled in an intensive course for the sole purpose of getting the required language study "over with" might have more difficulty in coping with the rapid pace and concentrated content of intensive instruction; however, evidence presented by Benseler and Mazur (1973) and Wallace (1972) indicates that, even without the impetus of an impending overseas experience, students can make substantial progress. Wallace reports that students without practical needs for knowing a language, after a three-week intensive course, scored above the 50th percentile rank for norms established for one year of conventional college study. Supporting results of other

studies, highest gains were made in speaking and lowest in reading.

Some Practical Considerations for the Implementation of Intensive Options

This portion of our essay will be devoted to some suggestions for those planning to offer intensive courses. The following aspects will be considered: (1) publicizing and recruiting, (2) screening and selection of students, (3) scheduling, (4) staffing and coordination of instruction, (5) granting of academic credit, (6) testing and evaluation.

Publicizing and Recruiting for Intensive Courses

Too often a major reason for lack of enrollment in a new or nontraditional course is that the option is not brought to the attention of those groups of students to whom it might be of special interest. Departments offering an intensive option must not only engage in general advertising (news releases to state, regional, local, and campus publications; announcements and posters to principals, high school counselors, and foreign language teachers in the state)--as suggested by Benseler (1978) and Nahrgang (1979)--but they must also make special efforts to attract those students who could especially benefit from intensive foreign language instruction. Washington State University, for instance, conducts a foreign language career colloquium to make students aware of the professional opportunities that proficiency in a foreign language can add to many careers. The same institution contacts incoming freshmen as well as resident graduate students, making the former group aware that the intensive summer language course can initiate them to university life, give them a head start on a major or supportive minor, or fulfill an academic requirement, and informing the latter group that the intensive option can enable them to meet Ph.D. or M.A. degree requirements after eight weeks of summer study.

Special contacts need to be made with students and advisors in the areas of business, music, drama, journal-

ism, communications, and military science, making clear the potential benefits of proficiency in a foreign language for their particular graduates. Foreign language departments should also develop descriptive brochures and work closely with placement and career counselors to make them aware of the availability and benefits of the intensive option.

Eventually, if a course is successful and achieves the objectives of students and instructional personnel, word-of-mouth advertising by students who have completed the course is the best recruiting device. A number of students whom Schulz (1978) interviewed at Dartmouth, Middlebury, and Washington State mentioned that they took the intensive option because former participants had recommended it, or that they had enjoyed a previous intensive course so much that they enrolled in a similar course in another language! Once a number of "satisfied customers" are available on a campus, those students might be willing to describe the option and their experience to classes and groups of other students.

Screening and Selection of Students

Intensive courses described in the professional literature often involve special categories of students. Therefore, their approaches and results cannot be generalized. Marti (1972), for instance, describes a course that enrolled students from the "Deans College" (described as "students who have indicated that they have the motivation and self-discipline necessary for independent work [and who] are not obliged to complete the General Studies program"). Other intensive programs deal largely with a self-selected or relatively select groups of students for whom higher than average ability and motivation in language learning can be assumed. Nahrgang (1979), for instance, suggests that high admission standards and quality of students may be a major factor in the well-publicized success of the Dartmouth Intensive Language Model. He maintains that if scholastic ability and motivation can be taken for granted, no further screening for intensive study is necessary. However, for institutions with a heterogeneous student body, or where foreign language study is required of all students, he proposes three screening devices (which we

present here and have expanded with the views and experiences of others).

(1) Measurement of foreign language aptitude or general academic ability. Marti (1972) used ACT scores of entering freshmen as a screening device. She mentions that two students admitted with low ACT scores were successful in completing the course, but did not excel. On the other hand, students with high ACT scores could be found in all ranges of achievement. While Kalivoda (1975) believes that high foreign language aptitude is not a necessary prerequisite for intensive study, Kilker and Gunderson (1972) consider the Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT) a highly reliable predictor for success in intensive language study. Grade point averages or SAT scores as predictors of success in intensive foreign language study might be additional factors worth investigating.

(2) Motivation and measurement of affective variables. Generally speaking, most educators who have had experience with intensive instruction believe that motivation is the single most important factor necessary for success. If we use Carroll's (1974) definition of motivation as "the amount of time the student is willing to spend in active attention and responding to the learning task," the importance of motivation becomes evident. Little experimentation has been done with objective tests of motivation, attitude, or interest as screening devices, but many programs utilize personal interviews to evaluate student interest in foreign language study and willingness to commit large amounts of time and energy. North Texas State University (Nahrgang 1979) has experimented with measuring attitudes toward German and language study and found large differences in the mean scores of those students who were eventually successful in completing the course and those who were not. Attitudinal tests, described by Jakobovits (1970), could also be used to investigate the relationship of affective variables and success in intensive foreign language learning.

(3) Self-screening. Nahrgang suggests self-screening by students as the single best selection device. This procedure, of course, assumes that the student is made fully aware of the nature and objectives of the course and of the necessary commitment in both time and energy.

Very little empirical data are available to suggest the superiority of one device over any other. While any single method of screening might be adequate, a combination of some of the above approaches might be most useful and might also provide information on the relative merit of the various selection procedures.

Scheduling

No predominant pattern of scheduling is evident in the programs described in the professional literature. Courses consist of from two to eight hours per day of structured classroom and laboratory time. At Dartmouth College, for instance, where intensive language instruction is year-round, students attend one daily large-group instructional period conducted by a master teacher. In addition, they attend a small-group drill session conducted by undergraduate apprentice teachers. The classes taught by the master teachers are scheduled like any other course throughout the instructional day, and students can select the most convenient period. The drill sessions are scheduled at less popular times (e.g., during the first period, at noon, or at five o'clock in the afternoon), in order not to interfere with other courses a student might take. The daily 30-minute laboratory period can be completed at the students' convenience.

At Dartmouth, students take other courses while enrolled in intensive instruction and cannot devote their time and energies exclusively to foreign language study. Kalivoda (1975), recognizing the advantages of permitting students to concentrate exclusively on foreign language study during an academic term without the distraction and demands of other courses, suggests a 15 credit-hour course that requires only 15 classroom contact hours per week but necessitates approximately 25-30 hours of laboratory drill and study at home. While he conjectures that "better learning results could possibly be had by eliminating requirements for home study and increasing student-instructor contact," Kalivoda believes that his proposed format would make intensive instruction more acceptable than it seems to be at present to college students, teachers, and administrators alike, because it requires no more classroom contact for students and

teachers than does a regular 15-hour credit or teaching load. Such a schedule, however, still permits students to concentrate on language study exclusively. Since one of the major reasons for high achievement in intensive courses is the increased classroom contact, some experimentation would need to be conducted to find out whether the objectives of an intensive course could be accomplished as well in the setting proposed by Kalivoda.

Scheduling during intensive summer programs poses fewer problems, since students are more willing and able to devote a time block exclusively to foreign language study. Programs offer up to eight hours of structured classroom contact divided between large-group lecture and presentation of materials, small-group drill or conversation practice, reading and writing, laboratory work, and testing.

Staffing and Coordination of Instruction

Not every language teacher will be automatically successful in intensive instruction. Personality should be carefully considered when selecting staff for an intensive course. Abundant energy, a sense of humor, enthusiasm, dedication, flexibility, and the ability to get along with students and colleagues are prerequisites. As their selection criteria for teaching personnel, Kilker and Gunderson (1972) list "linguistic competence, enthusiasm, pleasing personality, and proven competence in classroom teaching."

We mentioned above that most successful intensive courses utilize more than one instructor and a variety of staffing patterns. Not all departments can, of course, provide a full-time staff of six instructors or more for an intensive course sequence such as is available in the Middlebury summer program. Benseler maintains that one highly committed full-time professional, with the aid of two qualified assistants, can offer a successful intensive experience (1978:416). Naturally, the more staff available, the better. Intensive courses are not for instructors who insist on absolute academic freedom or instructional autonomy. A coordinated overall plan, which segments content into daily modules, must be adhered

to. We do not mean to imply that an instructional program or schedule is inflexible. Flexibility to adapt instruction to unforeseen student needs is one of the most important aspects of an intensive course. To retain this flexibility requires near-daily consultation and planning involving all staff. Cooperation and willingness to work together are therefore prerequisites for all instructional personnel.

The use of paraprofessionals (or teaching assistants, apprentice teachers, tutors, drill masters, conversation leaders, laboratory assistants, native consultants, informants, or whatever else they may be called) is accepted practice in intensive instruction. While the ASTP model insisted on native "informants" to serve as drill and conversation leaders, Kilker and Gunderson point out that "the value of native speaking teachers may be more psychological than real." Deveny (1979), however, considers the two hours that students spend in small-group conversation sessions with native paraprofessionals to be the most important of the instructional day. He sees the advantages of using native speakers not just in terms of their superior linguistic proficiency, but because of the cultural authenticity and interest such individuals lend the learning experience through gestures, facial expressions, reactions, and cultural insights.

At Oklahoma State University, native assistants are recruited on campus from among the foreign students and their spouses. Selection criteria take into account quality of native speech (i.e., it should be free, if possible, from major dialect interference), general educational background (while teaching experience is not a prerequisite for selection, preference is given to those applicants with prior classroom experience), personality, and knowledge of English. Deveny suggests that individuals should be outgoing, but not excessively independent, since highly independent individuals might have difficulty accepting guidance.

Assistants in intensive instruction can be paid hourly wages for their classroom and preparation time--the prevalent practice at most institutions--unless they are on a regular T.A. contract. Northern Iowa, however, uses a system in which student assistants can earn academic credit for their services (Schulz 1978).

It goes without saying that the use of paraprofessionals, whether native or non-native, requires careful training, supervision, and guidance. Dartmouth College has an intensive training program for the apprentice teachers before the start of each academic term; the program familiarizes them with techniques, classroom procedures, and materials. In addition to preservice orientation, Deveny (1979) suggests a demonstration class taught by senior staff or an experienced assistant.

Granting of Academic Credit

Successful completion of an intensive foreign language course can bring with it up to two years of academic credit. In such cases, Schulz (1978) notes, the relationship between the regular and intensive options becomes especially important, since students who are unable to complete the full course can also lose an entire semester's credit. One could argue, on the one hand, that departments should enable students to transfer from the intensive course to the next lower or concurrent conventionally taught course if they cannot for any reason complete the full intensive sequence. Moreover, in such situations departments should also allow credit for those parts of the intensive option that students have completed successfully. It might, therefore, be preferable for departments to offer an intensive course with the option of variable credit. Such courses would involve objectives, achievement levels, and content load identical to the instructional syllabus of the conventionally taught courses. Unit tests would be offered at specified time intervals, so that students could, if necessary, earn partial credit and still continue with language study in the regular curriculum.

The argument against this option, however, is that students who begin an intensive class should be aware from the outset that credit is awarded only for successful attainment of the objectives for the entire course. Proponents of this approach might contend that the demands of an intensive course necessitate a high degree of commitment on the part of the students. However, even those students possessing the necessary motivation sometimes feel overburdened and desire momentarily a less

rigorous learning situation. Were the opportunity for transfer without loss of credit available at such moments, it would doubtless be used. Since we see merit in both arguments, we feel that each department should determine its own philosophy in this matter, depending on local conditions and attitudes.

Testing and Evaluation

Because of the nature of instruction and learning in intensive courses, testing and evaluation assume a significance even greater than with other types of instruction. Early detection of learning problems or deficiencies is especially important because, as noted above, students might lose an entire term of course credit if learning difficulties are not detected at the outset. Another reason for frequent and systematic testing is the rapid pace of instruction and resulting lack of time for remedial work. Frequent evaluation (both announced and unannounced) also serves to decrease absenteeism. Since one day of intensive instruction can be the approximate equivalent of an entire week in a conventional course, regular attendance is a major prerequisite to student success.

Bookout (1979) suggests three major sources of evaluation: frequent quizzes and weekly formal classroom tests, daily laboratory monitoring, and evaluation by native assistants. Rapid feedback of test results to students is important, preferably on the same day that the quiz or examination is given. Test items should be high in diagnostic value (i.e., they should provide an indication of mastery of specific points of grammar and vocabulary), and similar items should be repeated on subsequent examinations to ensure retention.

Although laboratory assignment monitoring and evaluation by native informants are subjective indicators of student progress, Bookout mentions that "over a period of time . . . these evaluations do reflect the consistency, degree of preparation of the student, and his willingness to participate." Using assistants' evaluations also affirms the importance of the drill or conversation sessions to the students. Since assistants usually have little

training in formal evaluation methods, Bookout suggests developing a list of specific criteria that they can use for ranking students according to ability, performance, and participation.

Because of time constraints, criterion-referenced or self-paced testing is difficult during an intensive course. To accommodate the highly motivated learner who needs more time for mastery, we suggest that testing take place outside regularly scheduled instruction and that students be permitted to retake tests within specified time intervals if they fail to achieve a sufficiently high score to assure success in subsequent parts of the course.

Need for Further Development and Study

The literature on intensive instruction deals predominantly with college-level courses. While there is already a discussion in the 1945 Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals of the "ASTP Influence on Modern Language Teaching" (Miller 1945), intensive instruction has made few inroads on the secondary or elementary instructional levels. The Experiment in International Living and some college programs offer intensive options to high school students, but such instruction is outside the framework of the secondary curriculum. There are, of course, bilingual programs on the elementary and secondary levels that use the concept of intensive instruction. Derrick (1978) and Morrison (1972) describe bilingual immersion programs in languages other than Spanish for elementary school children.

Offering intensive instruction on the high school or elementary levels during the regular academic year might not be feasible in districts that do not have an individualized program and modular scheduling. Yet secondary schools do not fully utilize the opportunities that the summer months offer for intensive foreign language instruction.

The professional literature describes a range of short-term summer offerings providing remedial, enrichment, and special interest foreign language courses, as well as

short-term foreign language vacation camps--usually offered by colleges, park boards, ethnic societies, private schools, and private enterprise. But a 1969 ERIC Focus Report (Haukebo 1969) entitled "Summer Foreign Language Programs for School Students" makes only one reference to an intensive summer course, consisting of eight weeks of instruction and sponsored by the Chicago Board of Education.

Preisendorfer (1974) describes a 20-day intensive course for secondary students that covered the prescribed content of one year of French. While the program did not take place in an American high school, large school districts could surely marshal interest, support, and enrollments for intensive summer courses that would offer the equivalent of one Carnegie Unit in high school foreign language instruction.

Many high schools offer short-term study or travel abroad experiences during vacation periods and during the regular school year. Summer intensive instruction in preparation for such a trip could become an important and popular component of a high school curriculum and could enable a number of students to continue foreign language study in intermediate and advanced classes without infringing on the opportunity to take other electives that might compete for their interest during the academic year.

Another area with potential for development is intensive options at the advanced undergraduate levels of college instruction. With few exceptions, intensive courses are taught at the beginning/intermediate levels; on advanced levels, they are available at Middlebury College and at the University of Texas in Arlington. Foreign language majors and other students with a basic foundation in a language could benefit especially from an intensive exposure to the language to improve their fluency. Such options could, for instance, combine content and objectives of advanced conversation, composition, literature, and culture courses, and offer such instruction during one concentrated academic semester or summer term. Such intensive review and practice of skills could benefit those students unable to spend an extended period abroad and could be made a prerequisite for prospective foreign language teachers who cannot demonstrate sufficient

fluency in the language. Similarly, intensive programs for inservice or prospective foreign language teachers could improve their language and teaching skills or, if available on all levels, could enable them to pick up another teaching field to extend their opportunities for employment.

Further empirical studies are needed in many areas. We need extended documentation on the relationship of foreign language aptitude and success in intensive instruction. We need to investigate the interaction of various learning styles and intensive foreign language learning. The relationship between success in intensive courses and attitudes toward a particular language and culture as well as toward language learning in general needs to be studied. Knowledge about other attitudinal, motivational, or personality variables and their relationship to success in intensive instruction could be useful. Retention of language knowledge and fluency after a period of non-involvement with the language should be studied and compared after intensive and conventional instruction. Moreover, methodological factors and their relative efficiency in intensive instruction need to be investigated.

Intensive instruction holds much unexplored potential for making foreign language learning more accessible to a larger group of students than is now the case. We have evidence that intensive courses can achieve superior results in developing proficiency in a second language. Much discussion is currently being devoted to building programs that will enable students to develop sufficient fluency in a language to be able to use it, either in the U.S. or abroad, as an adjunct skill in their chosen profession. Students are exhilarated--when traveling or at home--by the experience of being able to interact with people of different languages and cultural backgrounds. For all these groups, an intensive foreign language experience can provide an optimum setting for acquiring these skills. We feel safe in predicting that the present trend toward intensive options will continue, and that foreign language departments in the 1980s will look increasingly at such options in order to meet the needs and desires of students and faculty.

Notes

[1]For a detailed description of such courses, as seen by a foreign language teacher in uniform, see Axelrod 1945a and 1945b.

[2]See especially two symposium issues of the German Quarterly: (1) "ASTP Issue," 17 (1944), pp. 165-240 and (2) "A Symposium on Intensive German Courses for Civilians" 19 (1946), pp. 1-94. The involvement of both language organizations and other scholarly associations in this process is described by Thompson (1973).

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

The names of several journals in this bibliography have been abbreviated as follows:

ADFLB	ADFL Bulletin
CMLR	Canadian Modern Language Review
DA	Dissertation Abstracts
FLA	Foreign Language Annals
FR	French Review
GQ	German Quarterly
Hsp	Hispania
MLJ	Modern Language Journal
S&S	School and Society
Sys	System
UP	Die Unterrichtspraxis

Documents identified by an ED number may be read on microfiche at an ERIC library collection or ordered from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210.

Abbott, Orville. 1955. Concentrated foreign-language courses. Journal of Higher Education 26: 380-82.

Adams, Walter. 1944. Can schools teach the GI way? The Texas Outlook 28: 10-13.

Agard, Frederick B. 1945. Language lessons war has taught. Virginia Journal of Education 38: 230-42.

_____. 1945. Reply to Professor Herman's article on the A.S.T.P. MLJ 29: 495-97.

_____ et al. 1944. A survey of language classes in the Army Specialized Training Program. New York: MLA, Commission on Trends in Education.

Aggeler, William F. 1950. The Army Language School. MLJ 34: 189-95.

Alméras, Philippe. 1976. An immersion course in French for beginners and near-beginners. ADFLB 7: 41-43.

Andersson, Theodore. 1969. From NDEA to EPDA: Can we improve? Hsp 52: 357-61.

Angiolillo, Paul F. 1947. Armed forces' foreign language teaching: Critical evaluation and implications. New York: Vanni.

Army methods in foreign languages adapted for civilian students. 1944. S&S 59: 324-25.

Army Specialized Training Program issue. 1944. GQ 17: 165-240.

Asher, James J. 1972. Differential prediction of student success in intensive language training. Final Report. San Jose State College, CA, Dept. of Psychology. ED 066 986

Axelrod, Joseph. 1945a. The Navy Language School program and foreign languages in schools and colleges: Aims and techniques. MLJ 29: 40-47.

_____. 1945b. The Navy Language School and college

foreign language departments: Personnel and organization. MLJ 29: 127-32.

Axelrod, Joseph. 1967a. From undergraduate student to professional teacher. An assessment of the NDEA institutes for undergraduates preparing to become elementary or secondary teachers of modern foreign languages. Washington, D.C.: U.S.O.E. ED 013 057

_____. 1967b. NDEA foreign language institute programs: The development of a new educational model. PMLA 82: 14-18.

Baumann, Cecilia C. 1976. Internationalizing the student body: Pomona College's Oldenburg Center. ADFLB 8: 45-49.

Beardsley, Wilfred A. 1947. Teaching languages in the Army University in Florence. Hsp 30: 27-31.

Belasco, Simon. 1971. The feasibility of learning a second language in an artificial unicultural situation. In The psychology of second language learning: Papers from the Second International Congress of Applied Linguistics, Paul Pimsleur and Terence Quinn, eds. London: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Benseler, David P. 1978. Increasing upper-division language enrollment through intensive language learning. FLA 11: 415-19.

_____ and Gertrud S. Mazur. 1973. A new approach to language learning for graduate students. MLJ 57: 259-62.

Bergel, Kurt. 1944. German conversation in the Army Specialized Training Program. GQ 17: 205-8.

Beyer, L.R. 1944. University of Illinois reports on its language teaching program. S&S 60: 325-26.

Birkmaier, Emma M. 1949. An investigation of the outcomes in the eclectic, reading and modified army method courses in the teaching of a second language. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Blayney, Lindsey. 1947. The ASTP and its lessons: Some merits and errors. MLJ 31: 43-46.

Bohning, Elizabeth E. 1947. The intensive course at the small universities. GQ 20: 14-15.

Bontempo, O.A. 1946. The language workshop: College of the City of New York School of Business and Civic Administration--Curriculum Vitae 1940-1946. MLJ 30: 319-27.

Bookout, Jonathan C. 1979. A discussion of testing techniques for an intensive language course. Paper presented at the Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Minneapolis.

Born, Warren and Kathryn Buck. 1978. Options for the teaching of foreign languages, literatures, and cultures. New York: ACTFL.

Bouniol, Eileen C. 1967. Language camps in the United States. DFL Bulletin. Dept. of Foreign Languages of NEA 6: 5-8. ED 013 036

Boyer, Mildred V. 1967. Language institutes and their future. In Foreign languages and the schools: A book of readings, Mildred R. Donoghue, ed. Dubuque, IA: Brown.

Brandt, Thomas O. 1944. War and languages. GQ 17: 72-78.

Brann, Henry W. 1944. The conversational method in modern language teaching: Its advantages and limitations. GQ 17: 209-15.

Brault, Gerald J. 1962. The special NDEA institute at Bowdoin College for French teachers of Canadian descent. PMLA 77: 1-5.

Brooks, Nelson. 1959. Plans for language institutes under the NDEA. Hsp 42: 241-42.

Bushnell, Marjorie R. 1944. The army technique in the high school class. MLJ 28: 190-91.

Calvert, Laura D. 1963. Notes on the Peace Corps language training program. MLJ 47: 319-23. ED 031 972

Campbell, Russell N., Donald M. Taylor and G. Richard Tucker. 1973. Teachers' views of immersion-type bilingual programs: A Quebec example. FLA 7: 106-10.

Carmody, Francis J. 1946. ASTP gives no help to French teachers. MLJ 30: 515-22.

Carroll, John B. 1962. The prediction of success in intensive foreign language training. Training, research, and education, pp. 87-136. Pittsburgh: Univ. of Pittsburgh Press. ED 038 051

_____. 1966. A parametric study of language training in the Peace Corps. Cambridge, MA: Laboratory for Research in Instruction, Harvard Univ. Graduate School of Education. ED 010 877

_____. 1974. Learning theory for the classroom teacher. In The challenge of communication, Gilbert A. Jarvis, ed. ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series, 8. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co.

Carton, Aaron S. and John B. Carroll. The 1959 summer Russian language-learning program. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Graduate School of Education. Mimeo.

Ceroni, Vittorio. 1944. Three months with the ASTP--Teaching Italian. MLJ 28: 46-49; 131-35.

Chestnut, David T. et al. 1975. Survival English: A second language program for Indo-Chinese refugees who resided at Fort Indiantown Gap during the summer of 1975. Harrisburg: Penn. State Dept. of Education. ED 125 294

Cohen, Andrew. 1974. The Culver City Spanish immersion program: The first two years. MLJ 58: 95-103.

_____. 1975. Successful immersion education in North America. Working Papers on Bilingualism 5. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. ED 125 241

Commission on Trends in Education of the Modern Language Association. 1944. Foreign languages and the army program. S&S 60: 78-79.

Conklin, Mildred and Stephen Murphy. 1976. Total immersion experiences. FLA 9: 442-43.

Conner, Maurice W. and Barbara Ludwig. 1974. Language camp guidelines. UP 7: 137-40.

Cooper, Robert L. and Lawrence Greenfield. 1969. Language use in a bilingual community. MLJ 53: 166-72.

Cooper, Virginia D. 1948. Before and after the ASTP. FR 22: 40-44.

Corbató, Hermenegildo. 1941. An experiment in the teaching of Spanish. Hsp 24: 389-96.

Cowan, J Milton. 1947. The Cornell plan of language teaching. Hsp 30: 57-60.

_____. 1959. The Arabic program of the Arabian American Oil Company. Report of the Tenth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies (GUMSLL 12), Richard S. Harrel, ed. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press.

_____ and Mortimer Graves. 1944. A statement on intensive language instruction. GQ 17: 165-66.

Cross, Ephraim. 1944. Language study and the armed forces. MLJ 28: 292-95.

_____. 1947. Learning foreign languages: A little politics and some economics. MLJ 31: 69-79.

Culhane, P.T. 1974. Some second thoughts on intensive language courses. Russian Language Journal 28: 10-15.

Cuthbertson, Stuart. 1948. Basic concepts in foreign language courses. Hsp 31: 201-5.

Derrick, William. 1978. An early language immersion model in a demonstration school. ADFLB 10: 34-36.

Deveny, John J., Jr. 1979. The intensive language course: Use of native speakers as conversation group leaders. Paper presented at the Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Minneapolis.

_____ and Jonathan C. Bookout. 1976. The intensive language course: Toward a successful approach. FLA 9: 58-63.

Diekhoff, John S. 1967. Institute programs: Curriculum, scope, and effectiveness. In Foreign languages and the schools: A book of readings, Mildred R. Donoghue, ed. Dubuque, IA: Brown.

Donald, Dorothy. 1946. Intensive classes in elementary Spanish and French. Hsp 29: 380-81.

Donahue, Moraima de Semprún. 1976. Applied Spanish for the social services: A different approach to foreign languages. ADFLB 7: 28-29.

Dostert, Leon. 1953. The Georgetown Institute language program. PMLA 68: 3-12.

Doyle, Henry G. 1943. Learning languages in a hurry: But not by miracles. S&S 58: 465-67.

_____. 1947. Progress on the foreign language front. The Journal of Education 130: 86-87.

Du Verlie, Claude. 1973. The disappearance of the academic foreign language program. American Foreign Language Teacher 3: 16, 18, 23, 28.

Dynamiting language. 1976. Time, 16 Aug., p. 56.

Dynnik, Al. 1969. On a new method of fast learning a foreign language. Russian Language Journal 23: 31-36.

Edberg, George J. 1959. A Spanish language practice course in an NDEA summer institute. Hsp 43: 570-71.

Eddy, Frederick D. 1944. The language studio. MLJ 28: 338-41.

Eddy, Frederick D. 1971. Institute training abroad for leadership in foreign languages: A preliminary survey of results. MLJ 55: 164-77.

Edgerton, William. 1948. A look at ASTP as student and teacher. MLJ 32: 209-15.

Elkins, Robert J. 1968. An evaluation of an intensive summer language program for secondary school students and suggestions for the improvement of future intensive programs. DA 28: 4373A-74A (Kansas).

Emmons, Kintzing. 1974. Intensive language sequences. Georgia Foreign Language Beacon 9: 12-13.

Ervin, Gerard L. 1976. So you're going to have a language camp? Some suggestions for making it work. FLA 9: 109-11; 113-16.

Fayer, Margaret L. 1944. Middlebury College and the army method of teaching languages. S&S 60: 79-80.

Feise, Ernst. 1943. Die deutsche Sommerschule von Middlebury College in Bristol, Vermont, 1943. Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht 35: 441-43.

Feldman, David M. and Barbara Schindler. 1964. An in-service alternative to the summer institute program. MLJ 48: 88-90.

Ferrari, Lucy. 1973. An intensive course in German for architects. ADFLB 5: 48-49.

Ferrigno, James M. 1958. A brief history of the University of Massachusetts language program. Hsp 41: 419-21.

_____. 1963. Peace Corps projects at the University of Massachusetts. MLJ 47: 323-27.

Fiks, Alfred I. 1966. A short Vietnamese language training course and research vehicle. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching 4: 236-54.

Fiks, Alfred I. 1968. A quantitative analysis of language training in the U.S. Peace Corps. Washington, D.C.: Peace Corps. ED 026 897

Fine, Benjamin. 1946. Education in review. Revision of language instruction based on lessons learned from the army. New York Times, 20 Oct., p. 13.

Foreign languages and the army program. 1944. Hsp 27: 382-83.

Foreign languages and the army program. 1944. S&S 60: 78-79.

Fox, Eugene J. 1959. Summer seminar for teachers of Spanish. Hsp 42: 80-81.

Frank, Ted E. 1972a. An intensive program in German. ADFLB 3: 31-32.

_____. 1972b. An intensive program in German. UP 5: 121-23.

_____. 1973. A practical approach to intensive German. UP 6: 5-8.

Frauenfelder, William. 1944. Lessons from the army language courses. S&S 60: 123-24.

Freeman, Stephen A. 1960. An evaluation of the 1959 summer language institutes. MLJ 44: 59-63.

Frenk, Bogumil W. 1973. An intensive summer course at Oklahoma SU. ADFLB 4: 40-41.

Frink, Orrin. 1967. Intensive language training. Occasional Papers in Language, Literature and Linguistics, Series A, No. 4. Athens: Ohio University. ED 021 488

_____. 1968. Intensive language training. In The study of foreign languages, Joseph S. Roncek, ed. New York: Philosophical Library.

Fryer, T. Bruce. 1975. Foreign language and business.

A lifelong experience. Paper presented at the Southern Conference on Language Teaching, New Orleans. ED 125 278

Fuchs, G.O. 1934. French in sixty lessons. FR 8: 68-70.

Fuerst, Norbert. 1944. Towards defining the intensive course. GQ 17: 201-4.

Fulbeck, Charles E. 1952. The significance of language training in the USAF. MLJ 36: 341-42.

Galpin, Alfred. 1944. Italian ASTP program at the University of Wisconsin. Italica 21: 25-28.

Gaston, Warren E. 1974. An analysis of student performance following two contrasting instructional methodologies in a modern foreign language program: A one-course intensive strategy versus the traditional two-year sequence for university (lower division) French. DA 35: 6435A-36A (Tenn.)

Genesee, Fred. 1976. The suitability of immersion programs for all children. CMLR 32: 494-515.

_____. 1978. Acquisition of reading skills in immersion programs. FLA 12: 71-77.

Girard, Daniel P. 1943. The teaching of foreign languages during and after the War. FR 17: 23-29.

_____. 1944. The War, foreign languages, and the schools of tomorrow. Teachers College Record 45: 471-77.

_____. 1947. The teaching of foreign languages since World War II. Teachers College Record 49: 179-85.

Giuliano, William P. 1947. A new army intensive language program. Hsp 30: 60-65.

Grauert, Wilfried. 1972. Intensivanfang: Ein Bericht über eine Unterrichtseinheit im französischen Anfangsunterricht. Die neueren Sprachen 21: 377-83.

Graves, Mortimer and J M. Cowan. 1942. Report on the

first year's operation of the intensive language program of the American Council of Learned Societies, 1941-42. Washington, D.C.: ACLS.

Gray, W.K. 1966. The intensive French conversation summer course at Elliot Lake. CMLR 23: 11-13.

Hamilton, D. Lee. 1946. Experimental program in Romance languages at the University of Texas. MLJ 30: 398-403.

_____. 1947. Changes in the teaching of Romance languages. The Texas Outlook 31: 36-37.

Hammerly, Hector. 1971. Recent methods and trends in second language teaching. MLJ 55: 499-505.

Harris, Julian E. 1945. The 'intensive' method at Wisconsin. FR 18: 338-49.

_____. 1949. Assumptions and implementations of the 'intensive method.' MLJ 33: 52-57.

Haugen, Einar. 1955. Linguistics and the wartime program of language teaching. MLJ 39: 243-45.

Haukebo, Gerhard K. 1969. Summer foreign language programs for school students. FLA 2: 477-80. ED 031 986

Hawkins, E.W. 1975. Intensive teaching. Times (London) Educational Supplement, 31 Oct., p. 33.

Hendrix, W.S. 1947. The Army Specialized Training Program. MLJ 31: 49.

Herman, Abraham. 1945. Comments on the survey of language classes in the ASTP. MLJ 29: 487-94.

Hills, E.C. 1919. Has the War proved that our methods of teaching modern languages in the colleges are wrong? A symposium. MLJ 4: 1-13.

Hirschmann, Rudolf. 1973. Report on the first German semester. Los Angeles: Graphic Services.

Horne, Kibbey M. 1970. Optimum class size for intensive language instruction. MLJ 54: 189-95.

Hoskins, John Preston. 1919. Modern language instruction after the War. S&S 8: 601-12.

Huberman, Giesela and Vadim Medish. 1974. A multi-channel approach to language testing. FLA 7: 674-80.

Hulley, K.K. 1945. Intensive language courses: Their bearing on teaching the classics. Classical Journal 40: 194-97.

Hutchinson, Mark E. 1944. The wartime language program as related to post-war language teaching. S&S 60: 33-36.

_____. 1946. The place of foreign languages in post-war education. MLJ 30: 256-64.

International business-language area studies. 1973. Hsp 56: 703-4.

Irving, Evelyn U. 1963. An NDEA institute's influence in changing foreign teaching methods. Hsp 46: 121-24.

Ittner, Robert T. 1944. Implications of the armed forces' language program. GQ 17: 176-82.

Iversen, Robert W. 1963. The Peace Corps: A new learning situation. MLJ 47: 301-4.

Jacobs, Gabriel H.L. 1978. An American foreign language immersion program: How to. FLA 11: 405-13. ED 159 919

Jakobovits, Léon A. 1970. Foreign language learning: A psycholinguistic analysis of the issues. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Johnson, Laura B. 1944. Some implications of the intensive language program for the classroom teacher. FR 17: 361-66.

Jones, Willis K. 1931. 'Novel' plan for learning modern languages. Hsp 14: 405.

Jordan, Gerda. 1977. Intensive language training for multinational business. UP 10: 39-43.

Kalivoda, Theodore B. 1975. Organization of intensive instruction: Dispelling misconceptions and facing realities. Hsp 58: 114-21.

Kaplan, David. 1971. An innovative structural plan for future second language institutes. Hsp 64: 312-15.

Kaulfers, Walters V. 1948. Post-war language teaching in California colleges. MLJ 32: 368-72.

Keating, L. Clark. 1946. Some reflections on the use of foreign languages by men in the armed forces. Hsp 29: 79-81.

Kercheville, F.M. 1934. Fitting the teaching of Spanish to community needs. Hsp 17: 175-80.

Kilker, James A. and Frank Gunderson. 1972. Intensely-French: A new program. FR 45: 850-54.

King, Charles L. 1969. A decade of NDEA language institutes. Hsp 52: 361-68.

Klarmann, Adolf D. 1944. The challenge of the army. GQ 17: 67-71.

Kohls, Siegfried. 1973. Eine optimale Ausbildungsvariante in fremdsprachigen Intensivkursen der DDR. Deutsch als Fremdsprache 10: 223-36.

Kulakow, Allan M. 1968. To speak as equals: Language training in the Peace Corps 1961-1966. Peace Corps Fac. Paper No. 1, Washington, D.C.: Peace Corps. ED 022 402

LaDu, Milan S. 1944. Army language instruction at Syracuse University. MLJ 28: 286-88.

Laiken, Henry. 1944. Can we streamline a language? Hsp 27: 172-75.

Lamson, Howard. 1974. Intensive language and cultural immersion: A cooperative method. FLA 7: 668-73.

Law, David A. 1976. An experiment in intensive foreign language teaching. Show-Me News and Views (Missouri) 7: 6-7.

Leavitt, Sturgis E. 1943. Why waste time? Report on the preliminary Spanish program, University of North Carolina. Hsp 26: 310-11.

Lindquist, Lilly. 1944. Why study foreign languages answered by our armed forces. MLJ 28: 289-91.

Logan, Martha E. 1938. Socializing the teaching of Spanish. Hsp 21: 293-300.

Lowe, John and Margaret Lowe. 1965. Teaching languages for specific purposes. In On teaching foreign languages to adults. Oxford: Pergamon.

Luce, Stanford. 1974. Report on intensive French offered in summer 1973 at Miami University. ADFLB 5: 27-28.

MacDonald, R. Ross, comp. 1966. Report on the intensive language courses for the blind 1960-1966. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. ED 013 029

Manuel, Herschel T. 1952. Results of a half-century experiment in teaching a second language. MLJ 36: 74-76.

Marckwardt, Albert H. 1963. Training the Peace Corps for English teaching abroad. MLJ 47: 310-14.

Maronpot, Raymond P. 1948. Vitalizing modern foreign language instruction. FR 22: 36-39.

Marti, Gertrude. 1972. An intensive French experience: Some observations and results. FR 45: 1145-51.

Mastronie, Joseph A. and John R. Bickley. 1959. Intensive method techniques for intermediate courses. MLJ 43: 181-82.

May, W.M. 1928. Trends in teaching modern foreign language. Modern Language Forum 13: 1.

McAuley, Robert E. 1969. Peace Corps language training: Academic implications. Tennessee Foreign Language Bulletin 16: 23-27.

McBride, Russell W. 1973. Foreign language learning for business. Training in Business and Industry 10: 29-34.

McCloy, C.H. 1956. Adult adventures with modern languages. MLJ 40: 170-72.

McCormick, John R. 1970. History of foreign language teaching at the United States Military Academy. MLJ 54: 319-23.

McGowan, Sister Jean Patricia. 1972. Measurement and evaluation of immersion-type teaching in secondary schools versus the traditional teaching existent today. Final report. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Research and Development. ED 066 097

McMullen, Eldon. 1955. The intensive method: An experiment. MLJ 39: 293-94.

Menut, Albert D. 1953. Intensive language courses. MLJ 37: 189-94.

Mildenberger, Kenneth. 1957. New directions in language teaching. Hsp 40: 345-47.

_____. 1961. Three years of the language development program (NDEA) Title VI. MLJ 45: 289-92.

Miller, V.D. 1945a. ASTP influence on modern language teaching. Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals 29: 164-72.

_____. 1945b. ASTP influence on modern language teaching. California Journal of Secondary Education 20: 263-70.

Mirick, G.R. 1944. Suggestions regarding language study for the future. Hsp 27: 68.

Mitchell, Walter, Jr. 1944. Languages for engineers after the War. Hsp 27: 383-86.

Monohan, Barbara. 1977. Some aspects of the teaching of an intensive course in Russian at Brown University. Paper presented at the annual meeting of AATSEEL. ED 149 639

Moore, Michael J. 1957. The Army Language School: An evaluation. MLJ 41: 332-37.

Moreau, M.L. 1966. Une méthode intensive de français parlé. Revue des langues vivantes 32: 532-35.

Moreland, Floyd L. 1968. From amo, amas, amat to Vergil in ten weeks; A report on the Berkeley 1967 Summer Latin Workshop. Foreign Language Association of Northern California. ED 025 173

Morgan, Bayard Q. 1943. Reflections on the 'intensive' course in foreign language. GQ 16: 199-200.

_____. 1950. What is foreign language study for? MLJ 34: 27-34.

Morris, Nell. 1937. A new Spanish course. Hsp 20: 169-72.

Morrison, Frances C. 1972. Evaluation of an experimental intensive French programme for grade eight students. Paper presented at the joint annual conference of CADE-CAFE-CAPE-CCRE-CERA-CIESC, McGill University, Montreal. ED 070 345

Moses, B. Hopkins. 1944. Methods of 'learning in a hurry': Their contribution to education. S&S 59: 348-49.

Moulton, William G. 1952. The Cornell language program. PMLA 67: 38-46.

Mueller, Theodore and Ralph Leutenegger. 1964. Some inferences about an intensified oral approach to the teaching of French based on a study of course drop-outs. MLJ 48: 91-94.

Myron, Herbert B., Jr. 1944. Teaching French to the army. FR 17: 345-52.

Nahrgang, W. Lee. 1979. Screening students for intensive courses: A survey of past and current practices, with suggestions for new programs. In Teaching the basics in the foreign language classroom: Options and strategies, David P. Benseler, Renate A. Schulz, and W. Flint Smith, eds. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co.

NDEA Institutes, Summer 1963. 1964. Hsp 47: 138-40.

Nebel, Henry M., Jr. 1965. The NDEA Russian language institute at Northwestern University, 1961-1964: A summation. MLJ 49: 243-48.

Neblett, Lucy. 1974. Intensive program: West Georgia College. Georgia Foreign Language Beacon 9: 12-13.

New York University, Bureau of Public Information. 1944. Army methods of teaching foreign languages. Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht 36: 109-10.

Nordmeyer, George and James F. White. 1946. Intensive German at Yale. GQ 19: 86-94.

Obanya, Pai. 1973. Improving language aptitude through intensive foreign language training: A pilot study. Teaching Language through Literature 20: 11-17.

O'Connor, Patricia and W. Freeman Twaddell. 1960. Intensive training for an oral approach in language teaching. MLJ 44: 1-42.

One year of the intensive language program. 1943. Education for Victory 2: 25.

Ortiz-Carboneres, Salvadore. 1977. Intensive language teaching in the University of Warwick. Sys 5: 178-80.

Oswald, Victor A. 1947. An intensive language experiment. Modern Language Forum 32: 84-89.

Paneth, Eva. 1971. Some functions of language workshops in the USA. Audio-visual Language Journal 9: 123-26.

Paquette, F. André. 1973. A paper tiger in an academic jungle. ADFLB 5: 5-7.

Parker, C.S. 1947. Intensive language instruction in the college curriculum. AAUP Bulletin 33: 347-57.

Parker, William R. 1955. The MLA foreign language program: The future of the foreign language program. Hsp 38: 84-89.

Pauck, Charles E. 1947. Some observations on a concentrated language course. MLJ 31: 214-17.

Paulsen, Wolfgang. 1944. The ASTP experiment and our future language courses. GQ 17: 167-75.

Peacock, Vera L. 1948. Foreign languages in teacher-training institutions. MLJ 32: 216-18.

_____. 1949. An expanded foreign language program in teacher training institutions. MLJ 33: 31-35.

Pei, Mario A. 1945. A foreign language teacher replies. AAUP Bulletin 31: 409-17.

_____. 1946. Languages for post-war trade. Hsp 29: 258-61.

Peinade, Bruno and Edgardo E. Torres. 1968. Spanish institute for high school students. Final report. San Leandro, CA: Unified School District. ED 027 787

Phillips, Walter T. 1949. How can we make our teaching more significant to our students? MLJ 33: 95-99.

Pitcher, Stephen L. 1946. Application of ASTP experience to language teaching in secondary and elementary schools. Hsp 29: 190-96.

Place, Edwin B. 1932. The University of Colorado experiments with language houses. Hsp 15: 29-33.

Polinger, Elliot H. 1945. Some solutions of the modern language problem. Hsp 28: 532-39.

Poston, Lawrence. 1969. Ten years of NDEA language institutes (1959-1969). Four perspectives and a memorial to the architect: William Riley Parker (1906-68). Hsp 52: 355-56.

Power, Camille B. 1948. Accelerated learning in Spanish. Junior College Journal 18: 434-37.

Prager, F. 1945. Defense of army-education technique as applied to foreign languages. S&S 61: 58-59.

Preisendoerfer, Hans. 1974. Ein Jahrespensum Französisch in zwanzig Tagen? Intensivkurs für Sekundarstufe--ein Modell. Praxis des neusprachlichen Unterrichts 21: 283-93.

Prince, J. Roy. 1969. An institute director looks back. Hsp 52: 368-75.

Rasmussen, Alice M. 1967. An evaluation of the language competence and opinions of secondary language teachers following participation in selected NDEA summer language institutes. DA 28, 2126A-27A (Georgia).

Rassias, John A. The Dartmouth intensive language model. Mimeo.

_____. 1970. Report to the ESSO Foundation on two years' experimentation in intensive language training at Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire, 1968-1970. Dartmouth College. ED 061 841

Ray, Kenneth. 1942. Foreign languages and the emergency. Hsp 25: 32.

Rehder, Helmut and W.F. Twaddell. 1944. A.S.T.P. at Wisconsin. GQ 17: 216-23.

Reiske, Renate. 1977. Mehr Mut zur Intensivierung des VHS-Sprachunterrichts. Zielsprache Englisch 2: 43-47.

Rénaud, Gaston. 1974. Conversational French: A study of immersion courses in French. Alberta Modern Language Journal 13: 26-36.

Report on teaching: --Foreign languages. 1978. Change Magazine 10: 28-49.

A Report on the 1959 summer language institutes. 1960. Hsp 43: 56-61.

A Report on the 1960 summer language institutes. 1961. Hsp 44: 103-16.

Reschke, Claus. 1977. Career education at the college level: A modest proposal. ADFLB 9: 43-47.

Richards, Henry J. and Teresa C. Salas. 1971. An intensive approach to beginning and intermediate Spanish. ADFLB 2: 27-30.

Richardson, Horst F. 1973. The teaching of college German under a modular system. MLJ 57: 189-94.

Rocklyn, Eugene H. 1961. Language programing for the foreign student. Paper presented at the convention of the Speech Association of America, New York City. ED 022 401

Rogers, Paul P. 1945. Lessons from the ASTP of language teaching for normal times. Hsp 28: 44-49.

Rowe, Benjamin. 1945. The army streamlines language instruction. MLJ 29: 136-41.

Sacks, Norman P. 1967. Modern Spanish in an intensive program for graduate students: An experiment and some reflections. Hsp 50: 310-19. ED 028 663

Santuosso, John J. 1954. ASTP characteristics in 55 colleges, 1941-1951. MLJ 38: 407-11.

_____. 1957. ASTP characteristics in 55 colleges, 1941-1951: Problems of application. MLJ 41: 9-14.

Savaiano, Eugene. 1969. Wichita State University's involvement in the NDEA institute program. Hsp 52: 375-83.

Scanio, Vincent A. 1944. Some lessons learned from the army intensive language program. Italica 21: 186-95.

Schaeffer, Rudolf F. 1944. The peace-time value of army language teaching to the trainee. S&S 59: 346-48.

Scherer, George A. 1945. A new college language course for beginners. MLJ 29: 503-8.

Schneider, Gerd K. 1975. Undergraduate German language program at Middlebury College. Summer 1975. Final report. Middlebury College. ED 116 464

_____. 1977. A model for a successful summer foreign language program in German. ADFLB 8: 27-29.

Scholz, Albert. 1947. Intensive German at Syracuse. GQ 20: 11-13.

Schueler, Herbert. 1944. Foreign language teaching under the Army Specialized Training Program. GQ 17: 183-91.

Schulz, Renate A. 1978. Survey of successful undergraduate foreign language programs in U.S. institutions of higher education. Washington, D.C.: NEH. ED 159 924

_____. 1979. Options for undergraduate foreign language programs: Four-year and two-year institutions. New York: MLA.

Scott, Joseph R. 1966. Can NDEA language institutes repay their debt to institutions? Hsp 49: 93-101.

Sculthorp, Mabel. 1964. Intensive first-stage courses for industry. In International conference: Modern foreign language teaching. Papers and reports of groups and committees. Preprints, part 1. Berlin: Pädagogische Arbeitsstelle und Sekretariat, Pädagogisches Zentrum.

Shao, Otis H. 1976. The Callison program: An integrated model in international education. ADFLB 8: 37-41.

Shea, Donald R. et al. 1963. The Peace Corps. MLJ 47: 298-329.

Smith, I. Norman. 1944. English in seven weeks. S&S 59: 221-22.

Smith, Paul E. 1944. Spanish language institute. Hsp 27: 355-60.

Sokol, A.E. 1946. The army language program. Journal of Higher Education 17: 9-16.

Springer, Otto. 1944. Intensive language study as a part of the college curriculum. GQ 17: 224-40.

Sprissler, Manfred. 1974. Fremdsprachenunterricht in Intensivkursen: Probleme und Perspektiven. Muttersprache 68: 348-63.

_____ and Harald Weinrich, eds. 1972. Fremdsprachenunterricht in Intensivkursen. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Stansfield, Charles W. 1975. Study abroad and the first-year student. Sys 3: 198-203.

A statement on intensive language instruction. 1943. American Council of Learned Societies.

Stephens, Doris T. 1978. An illustration of 'motivating students in the foreign language classroom' in an intensive French course. FLA 11: 25-29.

Stone, George W. 1957. The Modern Language Association and its foreign language program. Hsp 40: 344-45.

Strauss, George. 1973. French for oral fluency for primary teacher trainees. Babel 9: 7-9; 15.

Stroebe, Lillian L. 1919. Organization and management of summer schools for modern languages. Education 36: 5.

Strothmann, F.W. and Walter Lohnes. 1963. Final report of the Director on the combined second and third level National Defense Language Institute for Elementary and Secondary School Teachers of German conducted by Stanford University at Bad Boll, Germany. Stanford University. ED 129 094

Summers, Silas E. 1933. Spanish and internationalism. Hsp 16: 154-56.

A survey of language classes in the Army Specialized Training Programs. 1944. Hsp 27: 402-3.

A survey of language classes in the Army Specialized Training Program. 1945. (A report of a special committee for the Commission on Trends in Education of The Modern Language Association). New York: MLA.

Swain, Merrill. 1977. English-speaking child + early French immersion = bilingual child? CMLR 33: 180-87.

Symposium on intensive courses for modern language teachers: Report. 1972. (York, England, 1971). Council of Europe, Strasbourg, Committee for General and Technical Education. ED 082 541

Tabery, Julia J. 1973. A clarification of my remarks on 'Communicating in Spanish for medical personnel.' Hsp 56: 613-14.

Teaching languages to adults for special purposes. 1974. CILT Reports and Papers, No. 11. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching. ED 100 172

Teller, Gertrude E. 1944. Methods and readings in modern languages. GQ 17: 192-200.

Ternes, Hans. 1976. Another program abroad? ADFLB 8: 52-53.

Tharp, Robert N. 1960. Development of audio-visual techniques used at the Institute of Far Eastern Languages, Yale University. In Modern techniques in teaching foreign languages: Language laboratories. [Annual Bulletin 19 of the Connecticut Audio-Visual Education Association] ED 043 246

_____. 1964. The intensive Chinese language program at the Institute of Far Eastern Languages. In International conference: Modern foreign language teaching. Papers and reports of groups and committees. Preprints, part 1. Berlin: Pädagogische Arbeitsstelle und Sekretariat, Pädagogisches Zentrum.

Thayer, Marilyn. 1976. Adding the total immersion dimension: A case for extra-curricular programs. New York Language Association Bulletin 28: 12-14. ED 104 165

Thompson, Richard T. 1973. Modern foreign language teaching in the uncommonly taught languages. In Pluralism in foreign language education, Dale L. Lange, ed. ACTFL Review of Foreign Language Education, No. 3. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co.

Tiley, R.S. 1932. Suggestions for a new type language course. FR 3: 196-201.

Trace, Arthur S., Jr. 1960. Further threats of the new look in foreign language instruction. MLJ 44: 266-69.

Trevino, S.N. 1955. Some procedures in an intensive language course. In Report of the Sixth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Teaching (GUMSLL 8), Ruth Hirsch Weinstein, ed. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press.

Trites, R.L. 1977. Children with learning difficulties in primary French immersion. CMLR 33: 193-207.

Tyler, Dorothy. 1970. 4-1-4 and the audio-lingual skills. MLJ 54: 253-54.

Ungria, Enrique. Some ideas on the teaching of commercial Spanish. Hsp 26: 51-58.

Vail, Curtis C. 1944. The Rockefeller Language Conference. GQ 17: 120-30.

Van Eerde, John. 1968. A foreign language and culture program for engineers. FR 42: 272-76.

Van Hofe, Harold. 1943. Intensive language study at the University of Southern California. S&S 58: 430-31.

Waldman, M. 1932. New objective in modern language teaching. MLJ 16: 232-44.

Walker, Charles R. 1943. Language learning goes to war. S&S 58 [Condensed under the title "Teaching in a Hurry," Reader's Digest, May 1943.]

Wallace, John A. 1972. Three weeks equals thirty weeks? --A report on an experimental intensive January language course. FLA 6: 88-94.

Walsh, Donald D. 1954. The MLA foreign language program. Hsp 37: 83-93; 226-31; 341-48; 497-500.

_____. 1964a. NDEA institutes, Summer 1961: A survey. Hsp 47: 559-61.

_____. 1964b. NDEA institutes, Summer 1961: A survey. MLJ 48: 210-12.

_____. 1967. The national defense language institutes: A critical report. In Foreign languages and the schools: A book of readings, Mildred R. Donoghue, ed. Dubuque, IA: Brown.

Wattenmaker, Beverly. 1979. An intensive approach to high school foreign language learning. FLA 12: 65-70.

Waxman, Samuel M. 1945. Foreign languages and the U.S. Army. Education 65: 553-57.

Weinstein, Allen I. 1975. Foreign language majors: The Washington perspective. ADFLB 6: 18-27.

White, Emilie M. 1947. Post-war language--A challenge. MLJ 31: 208-13.

Whitney, Norman F. 1976. The training of language laboratory teachers: Some observations on an intensive programme for Israeli teachers of English. Sys 3: 84-87.

Wickham, Fletcher. 1939. The Rocky Mt. School of Language. MLJ 23: 262-64.

Wilcox, Stanley. 1973. FL notes: The National Defense Education Act of 1958 and language and area studies. FLA 6: 303-16.

Williamsen, Vern G. 1968a. A pilot program in teaching Spanish: An intensive approach. Final report. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education. ED 061 860

_____. 1968b. A pilot program in teaching Spanish: An intensive program. MLJ 52: 73-78.

Wilson, William. 1939. Spanish in the intensive study plan at the University of Washington. MLJ 23: 257-61.

Winchell, H.B. 1949. The twofold objective in the modern language program of the United States Naval Academy. MLJ 33: 445-49.

Yale University: Report of the President's Committee on the Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages. 1944. Hsp 27: 386-93.

Zech, Adolph. 1945. Appraisal and presentation of an intensive course in German. MLJ 29: 18-25.

Zellars, William C. 1944. Spanish for adults in Louisiana. Hsp 27: 51.

Zeydel, Edwin H. 1943. The ASTP courses in area and language study. MLJ 27: 459.

_____ et al. 1946. A symposium on intensive German courses for civilians. GQ 19: 1-95.

Ziegler, Carl. 1971. Taking the offensive: Accelerated elementary language courses at Indiana University. ADFLB 3: 28-30.

David P. Benseler (Ph.D., University of Oregon) is Associate Professor and Chairman, Department of German, The Ohio State University. Dr. Benseler is editor-designate of *The Modern Language Journal* and editor of *The ACTFL Annual Bibliography* and *Teaching the Basics in the Foreign Language Classroom: Options and Strategies*. He has published articles and reviews in *Foreign Language Annals*, *Monatshefte*, *ADFL Bulletin*, *The German Quarterly*, *Essays on the Teaching of Culture*, and the *Proceedings of the Pacific Northwest Council on Foreign Languages*.

Renate A. Schulz (Ph.D., The Ohio State University) is Associate Professor of German, University of Arkansas. Dr. Schulz edited the 1976 and 1977 Central States Conference publications and is associate editor of *The ACTFL Annual Bibliography*. She is author of *The Newspaper: A Reflection of Life Styles in the French-Speaking World*; *Options for Undergraduate Foreign Language Programs: Four-Year and Two-Year Colleges*; and co-author of *Lesen, Lachen, Lernen*. Her articles and reviews have appeared in the *ADFL Bulletin*, *American Foreign Language Teacher*, *Foreign Language Annals*, *The Modern Language Journal*, and *Die Unterrichtspraxis*.

LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION: THEORY AND PRACTICE

Volume 1 (1977-78)

1. *Directory of Foreign Language Service Organizations*, by Sophia Behrens. $3.95. (ED 153 503)

2. *The Linguist in Speech Pathology*, by Walt Wolfram. $2.95. (ED 153 504)

3. *Graduate Theses and Dissertations in English as a Second Language: 1976-77*, by Stephen Cooper. $2.95. (ED 153 505)

4. *Code Switching and the Classroom Teacher*, by Guadalupe Valdés-Fallis. $2.95. (ED 153 506)

5. *Current Approaches to the Teaching of Grammar in ESL*, by David M. Davidson. $2.95. (ED 154 620)

6. *From the Community to the Classroom: Gathering Second-Language Speech Samples*, by Barbara F. Freed. $2.95. (ED 157 404)

7. *Kinesics and Cross-Cultural Understanding*, by Genelle G. Morain. $2.95. (ED 157 405)

8. *New Perspectives on Teaching Vocabulary*, by Howard H. Keller. $2.95. (ED 157 406)

9. *Teacher Talk: Language in the Classroom*, by Shirley B. Heath. $2.95. (ED 158 575)

10. *Language and Linguistics: Bases for a Curriculum*, by Julia S. Falk. $2.95. (ED 158 576)

11. *Teaching Culture: Strategies and Techniques*, by Robert C. Lafayette. $2.95. (ED 157 407)

12. *Personality and Second Language Learning*, by Virginia D. Hodge. $2.95. (ED 157 408)

Volume 2 (1978-79)

13. *Games and Simulations in the Foreign Language Classroom*, by Alice C. Omaggio. $5.95.

14. *Problems and Teaching Strategies in ESL Composition*, by Ann Raimes. $2.95.

15. *Graduate Theses and Dissertations in English as a Second Language: 1977-78*, by Stephen Cooper. $2.95.

16. *Foreign Languages, English as a Second/Foreign Language, and the U.S. Multinational Corporation*, by Marianne Inman. $4.95.

17. *Testing Oral Communication in the Foreign Language Classroom*, by Walter H. Bartz. $2.95.

18. *Intensive Foreign Language Courses*, by David P. Benseler and Renate A. Schulz. $4.95.

19. *Evaluating a Second Language Program*, by Gilbert A. Jarvis and Shirley J. Adams. $2.95.

20. *Reading a Second Language*, by G. Truett Cates and Janet K. Swaffar. $2.95.

21. *Chicano English*, by Allan A. Metcalf. $2.95.

22. *Adult Vocational ESL*, by Jo Ann Crandall. $5.95.

To subscribe to the complete series of publications, write to the Publications Department, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209. The subscription rate is $32.00 per volume. Titles may also be ordered individually; add $1.75 postage and handling. Virginia residents add 4% sales tax. ALL ORDERS MUST BE PREPAID.